

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 13-CR-0023(1) (PJS/JJK)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

PETER CHRISTOPHER NUNN,

Defendant.

Defendant Peter Nunn pleaded guilty to two counts of interference with commerce by robbery, for which he was sentenced to concurrent 212-month terms of imprisonment and ordered to pay \$12,166.60 in restitution plus a \$200 special assessment. ECF Nos. 38–39, 48, 51. The matter is before the Court on Nunn’s second objection to receiving a “Notice of Intent to Offset” from the Department of Justice.

In 2021, after receiving a first “Notice of Intent to Offset” from the Department of Justice, Nunn filed a nearly identical motion in opposition to any administrative offset of federal benefits. ECF No. 63. Nunn argued that an administrative offset would violate the Court’s judgment because he was in compliance with a payment program. The Court denied the motion, noting that at sentencing the Court ordered that both the restitution and the special assessment were due immediately. ECF No. 64. The Court’s order was affirmed on appeal. ECF No. 68.

Nunn filed this second motion after receiving another notice of intent to offset. He raises no new arguments, but instead attempts to re-litigate the same issue that this Court has already decided and the Court of Appeals has summarily affirmed. Insofar as Nunn alleges these notices are “harassment,” he provides no basis for such a claim.¹ To the extent Nunn believes no payments are overdue at this time, the notice informs him that he may present evidence to that effect to the Department of Justice. *See* ECF No. 71.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, and on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT defendant’s motion for injunction to estop administrative offset [ECF No. 70] is DENIED.

Dated: November 29, 2023

s/Patrick J. Schiltz

Patrick J. Schiltz, Chief Judge
United States District Court

¹Receiving two letters over two-and-a-half years from the Department of Justice attempting to collect on a judgment of the Court could hardly be considered harassment.